

A

DISCOURSE

Against

Transubstantiation,

Delivered in a

S E R M O N

At

St. Warbrough's Church, Dublin,
on the 17th of September, 1699.

By the Learned Dr. Fowler, soon after his being admitted into the Communion of the Church of England.

Wherein he proves the Protestant Doctrine, concerning the Blessed Sacrament, by the holy Scriptures, from the Fathers of the Primitive Church, and by Sense and Reason, to be the only true Doctrine of Christ.

D. O. M.

In Testimonium Evangelicæ veritatis.

D U B L I N,

Printed for Jacob Milner, Bookseller in Essex-Street, and Samuel Adey Book-binder in Copper Alley, 1699.

St. Watorough's Church, England
on the 17th of April 1771

By the Rev. Dr. [illegible]
ing admitted into the [illegible] of the
Church of England

Wherein he professes the [illegible]
the [illegible] [illegible]
the [illegible] of the [illegible]
belong to [illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

[illegible]

A Sermon Preach'd at St. Warbroughs
Church on Sunday the Seventeenth day
of September, 1699.

St. Luke 22. vers. 19.

And he took Bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave to them, saying, this is my body, which is given for you, do this in remembrance of me.

THE blessed Sacrament of the Lord's Supper is one of the most important points of Christian Religion. All Christians agree, that it is a true and proper Sacrament, but they do not agree, how the invisible part thereof, namely the Body and Blood of Christ is present therein; or how conveyed and received. And this is the principle and source of all Controversies concerning the Sacrament and what divides the Christian World; for some grounded not upon Scripture, but upon Tradition, and Church-Authority, will have the blessed Sacrament, to be the Corporal and Real Body of Christ, as it was upon the Cross, and will have no Christian to believe, that the substance of the Bread doth remain in the Sacrament;

1 Opinion.

Others no better grounded or principled, affirm that the Body of Christ is corporally in the Sacrament, and that the substance of the Bread doth also remain.

2 Opinion.

The third Opinion, which in my poor judgment is no more consistent with Christian Religion, then it is with Reason, is that the Body of Christ is in the Sacrament, ~~and that the~~ Humanity of Christ is without bounds or limits, and is every where, and in all places, where his Divinity is.

3 Opinion.

We must not admire, dear Brethren, to see so many different O-
pinions

pinions concerning the blessed Sacrament, for it is what *St. Paul* foretold us in his first Epistle to the *Corinth.* 11. Chap. 19. vers. where speaking of the blessed Sacrament he says. *There must be heresies, that they which are approved among you,* might be known.

4. Opinion, and true Doctrine of Christ. The fourth Opinion, which I shall mention, and which is truly grounded upon Scripture, is, that in the Supper of the Lord the Body and Blood of Christ are given and taken, and eaten only, after an heavenly and spiritual manner, and the means whereby the Body of Christ is received, and eaten in the Supper, is Faith.

According to this Doctrine we believe the Body of Christ to be in the Sacrament, but spiritually. We believe that we receive the Body of Christ, but by Faith.

So that we may call the blessed Sacrament, as the Apostle does, a Remembrance or Representation of the Body of Christ, for in being such a Representation or sign doth consist the nature of a Sacrament.

I now, with the help of God, shall proceed to prove the truth of this Doctrine, and therefore that I may observe a clear Method to prove it, I shall lay down this Argument as a general principle.

The general principle and subject of this Discourse. The Doctrine that is most conform to the Word of God, to the soundest part of all the Fathers of the primitive Church, and to Sense and Reason is the true Doctrine of Christ. But the Protestant Doctrine, that I now explained, is the only Doctrine, in this Controversie, that is conform to the Word of God, to the soundest part of all the Fathers of the primitive Church, and to Sense and Reason. Therefore the Protestant Doctrine is in this Controversie the only true Doctrine of Christ.

The first Proposition, That the Doctrine, that is most conform to the Word of God, to the Fathers of the primitive Church, and to Sense and Reason, is the true Doctrine of Christ, is undeniable to any Man of sense.

As for the second, That the Protestant Doctrine is in this Controversie the only Doctrine, that is conform to the Word of God, to the soundest part of all the Fathers of the primitive Church, and to Sense and Reason, our Adversaries do deny.

I shall first prove it by the Word of God, that hereby Dear Christians, we may become stedfast and firm in our Faith and Belief, and this shall be the first part of my Discourse.

I shall secondly prove it by the Authority of the soundest part of all the Fathers of the primitive Church, I mean of the 1, 2, 3, 4. and 5th Century of the Church, that their Example may lead us, to dispose our selves often, to receive this blessed Sacrament with thanksgiving, and this shall be the second part of my Discourse.

In the third place, I shall prove it by Sense and Reason, and hereby you shall plainly understand, what Impossibilities and gross Contradictions, the Doctrine of our Adversaries doth force Christians to believe as Articles of Faith; and this shall be the third and last part of my Discourse, and the subject of your favourable attentions.

The First Part.

THE First Part which I have proposed, is to prove by the Word of God, that the Protestant Doctrine concerning the blessed Sacrament of the Lords Supper, is the Doctrine of Christ.

But before we come to the Proof of this Part, let us well understand in what our Adversaries and we do differ concerning the blessed Sacrament. They say that these Words, *This is my Body, and this is my Blood*, are to be understood in a literal sense, and are practical Words, (as they call them,) that is to say, that they produce what they signifie, and therefore they say, that the substance of the Bread and Wine, by these Words, is changed into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ.

*In what our
Adversaries
and we do
differ con-
cerning the
blessed Sacra-
ments.*

We say, that these Words, *This is my Body, and this is my Blood*, are to be understood in a figurative and spiritual sense, as those other Words of our Saviour, *I am the true Vine, I am the Door, and the Light*. At the utmost, the Words of Institution pronounc'd, are no more practical than in order to spiritual Effects. The Elements hereby are made the Sacrament, and a means to convey the Benefits

of Christ's Death and Passion to those who receive with Faith. And therefore we profess, that the Body of Christ is in the Sacrament, but spiritually, and that we truly receive the Body and Blood of Christ in the Sacrament by Faith.

And that this was the meaning, and mind, and intent of Christ, and the true sense of the Words, I prove first by the Words of my Text.

First Proof. If these Words, *This is my Body*, &c. be not understood in a figurative and spiritual sense, the Holy Ghost has inspired a manifest Contradiction. But the Holy Ghost, the Spirit of Truth, cannot inspire a manifest Contradiction; therefore these Words, *This is my Body*, &c. must not or cannot be understood in a literal sense, and therefore must be understood in a figurative and spiritual sense.

To prove my first Proposition, which is, that if these Words, *This is my Body*, be not understood in a figurative and spiritual sense, the Holy Ghost has inspired a manifest Contradiction; and to make this Argument clear, let us repeat the part of my Text wherein the difficulty lyes, *This is my Body*, And do this in Remembrance of me.

But if the blessed Sacrament be the real Body of Christ, (as our Adversaries do say it is,) it is a manifest Contradiction to say that it should be a Remembrance or Representation. The reason of this is clear, because nothing can be the Remembrance or Representation of itself; and therefore if the Body of Christ be in the Sacrament, (as our Adversaries do say it is,) the Apostle has written a manifest Contradiction, when he calleth the Sacrament a Remembrance or Representation: and consequently either these Words, *This is my Body*, must be understood in a figurative and spiritual sense, or the Holy Ghost has inspired a manifest Contradiction.

This you may well understand by this familiar Example, you cannot say in good reason, the person of the King is a true Remembrance or Representation of it self: But you can say in good reason, ~~this Image~~, or this Picture is a true Remembrance or Representation of the King. The reason is this, because by the principles of true Philosophy and Reason, nothing can represent it self; for what is Represented, and the Representation must be two different things, as the King and the Image or Picture of the King. So

So in like manner, if the Sacrament be a Remembrance or Representation of the Body of Christ, (as our Adversaries must own,) it cannot be the real Body of Christ; for then the Body of Christ should be a Representation and Remembrance of it self, which (as I proved) is a manifest Contradiction. Therefore these Words, *This is my Body*, &c. must be understood in a figurative and spiritual sense, and consequently, this is the Doctrine that is conform to the Word of God, and therefore the Doctrine of Christ, which I had to prove.

My second Proof of the Truth of this Doctrine, I shall take out of the very Words of the Institution of the blessed Sacrament, *This is my Body*, &c. 2. Proof.

For if the Doctrine of our Adversaries be true, and that by these Words the Substance of the Bread be changed into the Substance of our Lords Body, the Holy Ghost must have told an Untruth, so that when I prove that their Doctrine makes the Holy Ghost tell an Untruth, you shall plainly understand, that their Doctrine is false, and contrary to our Saviours Institution.

To demonstrate, that their Doctrine makes the Holy Ghost tell an Untruth, I argue thus :

He that tells us, that what is not Bread, is Bread, plainly tells us an Untruth. But the Holy Ghost by St. Paul plainly tells us that what is not Bread, is Bread, if their Doctrine be true. And therefore their Doctrine makes our Saviour tell an Untruth.

As for the first Proposition, that he that tells us, that what is not Bread, is Bread, tells us an Untruth, it cannot be denyed; for to say that a thing is, when it is not, is plainly to tell an Untruth.

As for the second Proposition; But the Holy Ghost by St. Paul tells us that what is not Bread, is Bread, if their Doctrine be true, I prove plainly thus.

For our Adversaries do say, and confidently affirm that after the Words, *This is my Body*, are pronounced, the Sacrament is no more Bread, but the true and Real Body of Christ, therefore according to their Doctrine, it is an Untruth to call the Sacrament Bread or Wine after these Words, *This is my Body*, &c. But after the Words, *This is my Body*, &c. the Holy Ghost calls the Sacrament Bread.

*According to the
Doctrine of our
Adversaries, it is
false to call the
Sacrament Bread
after the Words,
This is my Body.*

Bread and Wine; and therefore either their Doctrine must be false, or the Holy Ghost must tell an Untruth, but the Holy Ghost cannot tell an untruth, and therefore what is to be concluded is, that their Doctrine is false, and contrary to our Saviours Institution.

Now to finish this second Argument, and to shew you clearly the falshood of their Doctrine, and how far it is from the Doctrine and Institution of Christ. I shall prove that the holy Scripture calls the blessed Sacrament Bread and Wine, even after the pronouncing these Words, *This is my Body*, and *this is my Blood*.

The Holy Ghost calls the Sacrament Bread after the Words This is my Body.

In the first place out of the first Epistle of St. Paul to the *Corinth.* 11. Chap. 26, 27. and 28. Verses, where the Apostle expounds the mind of Christ, vers. the 26. *As often as you eat of this Bread*, vers. the 27. *Whosoever shall eat of this Bread*, and vers. the 28. *And so let him eat of this Bread*.

All this is said after the Words of the Institution, *This is my Body*; and therefore the Holy Ghost calls the Sacrament Bread, after the Words of the Institution, and consequently the Doctrine of our Adversaries, which will not allow, that the Sacrament can be truly called Bread after these Words of our Saviour, *This is my Body*, is contrary to the Doctrine and Institution of Christ.

Our Saviour do call the Sacrament Wine after the Words This is my Blood. Observe that the fourth Council of Orleans in the 6th Century of the Church ordained in the 4th Can. That in the Offering of the holy Chalice, nothing shall be presented, except Wine only, unmixed with Water, because it is a Sacrilegious thing to transgress the holy Mandate and Institution of our Saviour Christ. But notwithstanding, this Canon, this Sacrilege and transgression of the Institution of our Saviour Christ is constant in the Church of Rome to this day, for they always mix the Wine with Water.

Secondly it is evident in the holy Gospel according to St. Matthew, that our Saviour himself, after he had ordained the blessed Sacrament calls it Wine, Chap. 26. vers. 29. where we read these Words of our Saviour after the Institution of the blessed Sacrament; *For I say unto you, that I will not drink henceforth of this fruit of the Vine, until that day, when I shall drink it new with you in my Fathers Kingdom.* But to call it the fruit of the Vine, or to call it Wine, is the same thing, therefore the Holy Ghost, after the Words, *This is my Body*, and *this is my Blood*, calls the Sacrament Bread and Wine, and therefore the Doctrine of our Adversaries, which denys it to be

be so, is to be rejected as false, and as contrary to the Words of our Saviours Institution, which I had to prove.

My third Argument to prove the Truth of my Proposition shall be out of the 6th Chap. of the holy Gospel according to St. *John*.

For our Adversaries finding no other place of the holy Scripture to favour their Cause, do plead (though to no purpose) this 6th Chap. of St. *John*, and they make it a principle (though but a pretended one,) and sure ground of their Doctrine.

But to shew you with clear Method upon what weak principles and grounds they establish their Doctrine.

I shall first prove, that in case we grant, as we do not, that this 6th Chapter of St. *John* is to be understood of the blessed Sacrament, it proves plainly our Doctrine.

Secondly I shall prove that their Arguments out of this Chapter are uncertain, and consequently of no importance.

In the third place I shall prove, that the Fathers, who in the primitive Church expounded, this 6th Chapter of St. *John*, do understand it, as we do in a figurative and spiritual sense.

As for my first Proposition, which is, in case we grant, as we do not, that this Chapter is to be understood of the blessed Sacrament, it proves plainly our Doctrine; I prove thus.

If in this Chapter from the 51st to the 58. Verse (where there is mention of the blessed Sacrament as they say, but we do not grant,) there is not one Verse, but what doth agree with our Doctrine, or one Expression, but what must be understood in a spiritual sense, this Chapter proves plainly our Doctrine. But from the 51. to the 58. Verse, all this Chapter doth agree with our Doctrine, and all must be understood in a spiritual sense; therefore this Chapter proves plainly our Doctrine.

*The sixth
Chapter of St.
John doth
agree with
our Doctrine,
and proves it
plainly.*

The first Proposition is evident, for if there be not one Verse, but what doth agree with our Doctrine, and but what must be understood spiritually; it is plain that it proves our Doctrine.

As for the second Proposition, that from the 51. to the 58. Verse, all this Chapter doth agree with our Doctrine, and all must be understood in a spiritual sense, our Adversaries do deny.

This.

This Proposition has two parts, which must be separately proved. The first part is, that all this Chapter doth agree with our Doctrine. The second that it must be understood in a spiritual sense.

I shall prove the first part by laying down before you, the very Text of this Chapter, and by shewing you the conformity of our Doctrine with the sense of every Verse, for thence it shall evidently appear that this Chapter doth agree with our Doctrine.

Our Doctrine is conform to this Chapter. We read in the 51. Verse, *I am that living Bread, which came down from Heaven, if any Man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever, and the Bread, that I will give, is my Flesh, which I will give for the life of the World.* In this Verse I say, nor in the following Verses (for it is the same sense) is not one expression but what our Doctrine is conform to.

We own and profess that Christ came down from Heaven, when sent by his heavenly Father: but our Adversaries must own, that Christ, when he came down from Heaven, was no natural or earthly Bread.

Our Adversaries are forced to understand the beginning of the 51. vers. in a spiritual sense. Therefore of necessity they must understand the beginning of this Verse, in a spiritual sense; which is our Doctrine. Let us now examine the second part of the Text, *if any Man eat of this Bread he shall live for ever.* This is our Doctrine, for we own, that if any Man, or rather every Man who truly and sincerely disposed eats, of this Bread with true faith, shall live for ever, and our Adversaries cannot deny, but that this is the true sense of this part of the Text, for they cannot deny, but the spiritual eating by Faith is the only means to obtain the benefit of this Sacrament, and everlasting life.

The third part is; *And the Bread that I will give, is my Flesh,* we own that it is the Flesh of Christ to all true Believers by Faith.

Lastly, *which I will give for the life of the World,* we own, that our Saviour gave his Body and Flesh, for the life of the World upon the Cross, and to us in the Sacrament by Faith in Remembrance of his own Death and Passion, that the Sacrament received with Faith, might be a sure means for the World, to apply unto themselves the Merits of our Saviour, and therefore our Doctrine in every part of it is conform to this Chapter.

Now

Now I prove the second part of my Proposition, which is, that this Text as well as the following Verses of this Chapter are to be understood in a spiritual sense, by the Words of our Saviour in this Chapter, vers. 63. where our Saviour explains himself, and opens his mind to his Disciples, when they murmured, and were offended at his Speech, saying, *It is the Spirit that quickeneth, and the Flesh profiteth nothing, the Words that I speak unto you, are spirit and life.* By these Words our Saviour doth appease his Disciples, assuring them, that what he said in the foregoing Verses is to be understood in a spiritual sense, and that this was our Saviours meaning by these Words is plain, for the best Expositors of the primitive Church, who expounded this Chapter, do understand and expound it in a spiritual sense. *Origenes* that famous Expositor of Scripture, who lived and writ in the beginning of the Third Century of the Church, says no less, " then that it is eternal death for any Man " to understand this Chapter in its literal sense, these are his Words and Doctrine in his 7th Homilie or exposition of *Leviticus*, where after he affirmed that the Flesh of Christ is the Word of God, he adds this exposition of this 6th Chapter of *St. John*. *Si enim secundum litteram sequaris hoc, quod dictum est, nisi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis, & biberitis ejus sanguinem, occidit hæc litera.* That is to say; " " for if you believe in a literal sense, what it is said, except you " eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, that literal sense kills. The Consequence, therefore is clear, that this Chapter is to be understood in a figurative and spiritual sense, which is what I had to prove in the second part of my First Proposition.

Prove that this Verse as well as the rest of this Chapter is to be understood in a spiritual sense.

Origenes died Anno 256.

The second Proposition that I have to prove is, that their Arguments out of this Chapter are uncertain, and therefore of no importance.

The Arguments of our Adversaries out of the 6th Ch. of St. John are uncertain.

The Proof of this Proposition is plain by this only Argument.

Their Arguments out of this Chapter are uncertain and consequently of no importance, if all our Doctors and many of their own best Doctors affirm that this Chapter

They do not agree among themselves whether this 6th Chap. of St. John is to be understood of his Sacrament, which is sufficient to show the uncertainty of their Arguments.

This Proposition has two parts, which must be separately proved. The first part is, that all this Chapter doth agree with our Doctrine. The second that it must be understood in a spiritual sense.

I shall prove the first part by laying down before you, the very Text of this Chapter, and by shewing you the conformity of our Doctrine with the sense of every Verse, for thence it shall evidently appear that this Chapter doth agree with our Doctrine.

Our Doctrine is conform to this Chapter. We read in the 51. Verse, *I am that living Bread, which came down from Heaven, if any Man eat of this Bread, he shall live for ever, and the Bread, that I will give, is my Flesh, which I will give for the life of the World.* In this Verse I say, nor in the following Verses (for it is the same sense) is not one expression but what our Doctrine is conform to.

We own and profess that Christ came down from Heaven, when sent by his heavenly Father: but our Adversaries must own, that Christ, when he came down from Heaven, was no natural or earthly Bread.

Our Adversaries are forced to understand the beginning of the 51. vers. in a spiritual sense. Therefore of necessity they must understand the beginning of this Verse, in a spiritual sense; which is our Doctrine. Let us now examine the second part of the Text, *if any Man eat of this Bread he shall live for ever.* This is our Doctrine, for we own, that if any Man, or rather every Man who truly and sincerely disposed eats, of this Bread with true faith, shall live for ever, and our Adversaries cannot deny, but that this is the true sense of this part of the Text, for they cannot deny, but the spiritual eating by Faith is the only means to obtain the benefit of this Sacrament, and everlasting life.

The third part is; *And the Bread that I will give, is my Flesh,* we own that it is the Flesh of Christ to all true Believers by Faith.

Lastly, *which I will give for the life of the World,* we own, that our Saviour gave his Body and Flesh, for the life of the World upon the Cross, and to us in the Sacrament by Faith in Remembrance of his own Death and Passion, that the Sacrament received with Faith, might be a sure means for the World, to apply unto themselves the Merits of our Saviour, and therefore our Doctrine in every part of it is conform to this Chapter.

Now

Now I prove the second part of my Proposition, which is, that this Text as well as the following Verses of this Chapter are to be understood in a spiritual sense, by the Words of our Saviour in this Chapter, vers. 63. where our Saviour explains himself, and opens his mind to his Disciples, when they murmured, and were offended at his Speech, saying, *It is the Spirit that*

Proove that this Verse as well as the rest of this Chapter is to be understood in a spiritual sense.

quickeneth, and the Flesh profiteth nothing, the Words that I speak unto you, are spirit and life. By these Words our Saviour doth appeale his Disciples, assuring them, that what he said in the foregoing Verses is to be understood in a spiritual sense, and that this was our Saviours meaning by these Words is plain, for the best Expositors of the primitive Church, who expounded this Chapter, do understand and expound it in a spiritual sense. *Origenes* that famous Expositor of Scripture, who lived and writ in the beginning of the Third Century of the Church, sayes no less, " then that it is eternal death for any Man " to understand this Chapter in its literal sense, these are his Words and Doctrine in his 7th Homilie or exposition of *Leviticus*, where after he affirmed that the Flesh of Christ is the Word of God, he adds this exposition of this 6th Chapter of *St. John*. *Si enim secundum litteram sequaris hoc, quod dictum est, nisi manducaveritis carnem filii hominis, & liberitis ejus sanguinem, occidit haec littera.* That is to say; " " for if you believe in a literal sense, what it is said, except you " eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, that literal sense kills. The Consequence, therefore is clear, that this Chapter is to be understood in a figurative and spiritual sense, which is what I had to prove in the second part of my First Proposition.

Origenes died Anno 256.

The second Proposition that I have to prove is, that their Arguments out of this Chapter are uncertain, and therefore of no importance.

The Arguments of our Adversaries out of the 6th Ch. of St. John are uncertain.

The Proof of this Proposition is plain by this only Argument.

Their Arguments out of this Chapter are uncertain and consequently of no importance, if all our Doctors and many of their own best Doctors affirm that this Chapter

They do not agree among themselves whether this 6th Chap. of St. John is to be understood of the Sacrament, which is sufficient to shew the uncertainty of their Arguments.

is by no means to be understood of the blessed Sacrament. But our Doctors in general, and many of their own best Doctors affirm, that this Chapter is not to be understood of the blessed Sacrament. Therefore their Arguments out of this Chapter are uncertain, and consequently of no importance.

There is not one Word of this Argument, that can be reasonably denied.

The 6th Chap. of St. John is not to be understood of the blessed Sacrament.

For we deny that this Chapter is to be understood of the blessed Sacrament.

First, because the Sacrament of the Lords Supper was ordained by Christ the Night before he suffered. But the Speech contained in this Chapter, Christ made to his Disciples a full Year before his Passion, as our Adversaries do confess; Therefore this Chapter is not to be understood of the blessed Sacrament.

Secondly we do not read in this Chapter the Words of the Institution of the blessed Sacrament; for in this Chapter we read only a Relation of eating heavenly Bread that giveth life. But such a Relation is nothing to the Institution of a Sacrament. And therefore this Chapter is not to be understood of the blessed Sacrament.

Thirdly it is evident that the manner of eating heavenly Bread that giveth life, as we read in this Chapter, is the spiritual eating of it by Faith, as our Adversaries must own. And therefore this Chapter cannot be understood of the blessed Sacrament, and much less in the sense that our Adversaries do pretend.

Many of their best Doctors do affirm, that the 6th Chap. of St. John is not to be understood of the Sacrament.

Now I prove the second part of my Proposition, that many of their own best Doctors affirm, that this Chapter is not to be understood of the blessed Sacrament, and consequently that their Arguments are uncertain, and therefore of no importance. *Gabriel* one of their chief Doctors in his 84th Lesson proves, that in this 6th Chapter of *St. John*, is not one Word of the blessed Sacrament. *Cusanus* one of their most learned Doctors in his 7th Epistle to the Bohemians is of the same Opinion. *Cajetan* who was one of their best Divines, doth plainly prove the same Doctrine in the 3d part of his Divinity Works 80th quest. and last Article. *Taperus* an Eminent Doctor among them in his Exposition of the 15th Article of the Doctrine

Doctrines of *Lovaine*. And *Jansenius* that famous Bishop of *Ipers*, in the 15th Chapter of his Concord, doth plainly prove this Doctrine. And therefore the Arguments of our Adversaries out of this 6th Chapter of *St. John* are uncertain, and consequently of no importance, which I had to prove.

My third and last Proposition, which is that the Fathers of the primitive Church, who expounded this 6th Chapter of *St. John* do understand it as we do, in a figurative and spiritual sense, is already proved by the testimony of *Origenes*, and it shall plainly appear by the second Part of my Discourse, where I am to prove, that the Protestant Doctrine is the only Doctrine that is conform to the Fathers of the primitive Church.

Dear Christians, the advantage and profit I proposed my self by laying down before you the Proofs of the Doctrine of Christ, out of his own holy Word, is, that we may become more and more steadfast and firm in our Faith and Belief, and that we should not be lead or seduced by any false Doctrine; human inventions, or trivial subtilties; And so I finish this first part of my Discourse with that comfortable Advice of *St. Paul* to the *Coloss.* 2. Chap. 6. and 7. Verses. *As ye have received Christ Jesus the Lord, so walk ye in him, rooted and built up in him, and stablished in the Faith, as ye have been taught, abounding therein with Thanksgiving.*

Now let us come to the second Proof of this Doctrine, wherein I am to prove the Protestant Doctrine to be the true Doctrine of Christ, by the Authority of the Fathers of the primitive Church, which is the second Part of this Discourse.

The Second Part.

THough it is needless after the holy Scripture to appeal to any other Authority to prove the Truth of our Doctrine, yet because our Adversaries with Ostentation and great Confidence do endeavour to perswade, or rather to seduce Christians to believe, that their Doctrine was the Doctrine of the primitive Church; I shall therefore with the help of God, prove that the soundest Part of all the Fathers of the primitive Church, I mean of the 1, 2, 3, 4. and 5th Century of the Church held, taught and writ our Doctrine in plain Terms.

To prove this second Part of my Proposition, and to understand the Mind and Doctrine of the Fathers of the primitive Church, this following Argument shall serve as a general Principle, which when I prove, it shall plainly appear, that our Doctrine is the only Doctrine, that is conform to the Fathers of the primitive Church.

A Principle to understand how the Fathers of the primitive Church called and believed the Sacrament.

If the foudest Part of all the Fathers of the primitive Church do call the Sacrament Bread, sometimes a Remembrance or Representation, sometimes the figure of the Body of Christ. And if they affirm, that the Apostles had not received or eaten the Body of Christ, which they had seen, or drank his Blood which was spilt, but spiritually and by Faith, our Doctrine is the only Doctrine, that is conform to the Fathers of the primitive Church.

But the foudest part of all the Fathers of the Primitive Church, do call the Sacrament Bread, sometimes a remembrance, Representation or Figure of the Body of Christ; and they affirm that the Apostles did not eat the Body of Christ which they had seen, or drank his Blood which was spilt, but Spiritually and by Faith. Therefore our Doctrine is the only Doctrine that is conform, to the Fathers of the Primitive Church.

The First Proposition of this Argument is evident, and I prove the First Part of the Second, the Fathers of the Primitive Church do call the Sacrament Bread.

The First Century Ignatius suffered an. 110.

Ignatius who lived in the time of the Apostles, and Writ in the First Century of the Church, in his Epistle to the Philadelphians, proves plainly the First Part of my Proposition, and our Doctrine by these words.

Ignatius calls the Sacrament only Bread.

Rogo vos at Instetis uni Fidei, uni Prædicationi, una Eucharistiâ tentes, una est caro Domini Jesu, & unus Sanguis, qui pro nobis effusus est; unus etiam panis pro omnibus confractus, & unus calix totius Ecclesiæ. That is to say.

"I pray you stand to one Faith, and to one Gospel, and make use of one Sacrament, there is but one Flesh of the Lord Jesus, and one Blood which is spilled for us: In like manner there is but one Bread broken for us all, and one Cup of the whole Church.

This passage is an evident Proof, of the First Part of my Proposition, that the Fathers of the Primitive Church, do call the Sacra-

ment

ment Bread, and not this only, but *Ignatius* in this passage doth distinguish the Flesh from the Bread, and the Blood from the Cup, to shew us plainly that in the Sacrament, is only Bread and Wine, and he makes use of these words, Bread and broken for us, to prove that it is Bread that we break.

Our Adversaries do take great pains to answer this Doctrine by Sophistical distinctions never known to *Ignatius*, as may appear to any man of Sense, by the only Reading of his Works.

Now that I have proved the First Part of my Proposition, that the Sacrament in the First Century of the Church, was called and believed Bread; I prove the Second Part, that it was called and believed a Representation of the Body of Christ.

Tertullian who Lived and Writ in the Second Century of the Church, and an Eminent Doctor, in his First Book against *Marcion* the Heretick, doth plainly prove this Second Part of my Proposition, by these words. *Usque nunc nec aquam reprobavit Creatoris, quâ suos abluit. — Nec Panem in quo ipsum Corpus suum representat.* That is to say, neither has he [viz. Christ] to this time rejected or disdained Water, wherewith he washeth his own, (speaking of Baptism) nor Bread whereby he representeth his own Body, speaking of the Sacrament.

2. Century
*Tertullian flourish-
ed An. 210.*

In his First
Book against
Marcion, a li-
tle before the
middle of the
Book.

This ancient Father, could not explain our Doctrine in more plain terms; for he doth not say, the Bread which is his true and real Body, but the Bread whereby he representeth his Body, which is our Doctrine, and what I had to prove in the Second Part of my Proposition.

And in his Third Book against the same Heretick.

In his Third
Book against
Marcion.

Hoc lignum & ferentias tibi insinuat victuris prædicans Judæis venite mittamus lignum in panem ejus, utique in corpus sic enim Deus in Evangelio quoque vestro revelavit, panem corpus suum appellans, ut & hinc jam cum intelligas corporis sui figuram dedisse, cujus retro corpus in panem Prophetes figuravit. That is to say

“ The Prophet *Jeremiah* has plainly described this Wood, for
“ telling the Jews, what their Posterity should say, Come let u
“ thrust Wood into his Bread, even into his Body; for so has GO
“ Reveale

To prove this second Part of my Proposition, and to understand the Mind and Doctrine of the Fathers of the primitive Church, this following Argument shall serve as a general Principle, which when I prove, it shall plainly appear, that our Doctrine is the only Doctrine, that is conform to the Fathers of the primitive Church.

A Principle to understand how the Fathers of the primitive Church called and believed the Sacrament. If the soundest Part of all the Fathers of the primitive Church do call the Sacrament Bread, sometimes a Remembrance or Representation, sometimes the figure of the Body of Christ. And if they affirm, that the Apostles had not received or eaten the Body of Christ, which they had seen, or drank his Blood which was spilt, but spiritually and by Faith, our Doctrine is the only Doctrine, that is conform to the Fathers of the primitive Church.

But the soundest part of all the Fathers of the Primitive Church, do call the Sacrament Bread, sometimes a remembrance, Representation or Figure of the Body of Christ; and they affirm that the Apostles did not eat the Body of Christ which they had seen, or drank his Blood which was spilt, but Spiritually and by Faith. Therefore our Doctrine is the only Doctrine that is conform, to the Fathers of the Primitive Church.

The First Proposition of this Argument is evident, and I prove the First Part of the Second, the Fathers of the Primitive Church do call the Sacrament Bread.

The First Century Ignatius - suffered an. 110. Ignatius who lived in the time of the Apostles, and Writ in the First Century of the Church, in his Epistle to the Philadelphians, proves plainly the First Part of my Proposition, and our Doctrine by these words.

Ignatius calls the Sacrament only bread. *Rogo vos at Instetis uni Fidei, uni Prædicationi, una Eucharistiâ tentes, una est caro Domini Jesu, & unus Sanguis, qui pro nobis effusus est; unus etiam panis pro omnibus confractus, & unus calix totius Ecclesiæ.* That is to say,

"I pray you stand to one Faith, and to one Gospel, and make use of one Sacrament, there is but one Flesh of the Lord Jesus, and one Blood which is spilled for us: In like manner there is but one Bread broken for us all, and one Cup of the whole Church.

This passage is an evident Proof, of the First Part of my Proposition, that the Fathers of the Primitive Church, do call the Sacrament

ment Bread, and not this only, but *Ignatius* in this passage doth distinguish the Flesh from the Bread, and the Blood from the Cup, to shew us plainly that in the Sacrament, is only Bread and Wine, and he makes use of these words, Bread and broken for us, to prove that it is Bread that we break.

Our Adversaries do take great pains to answer this Doctrine by Sophistical distinctions never known to *Ignatius*, as may appear to any man of Sense, by the only Reading of his Works.

Now that I have proved the First Part of my Proposition, that the Sacrament in the First Century of the Church, was called and believed Bread; I prove the Second Part, that it was called and believed a Representation of the Body of Christ.

Tertullian who Lived and Writ in the Second Century of the Church, and an Eminent Doctor, in his First Book against *Marcion* the Heretick, doth plainly prove this Second Part of my Proposition, by these words. *Usque nunc nec aquam reprobavit Creatoris, quâ suos abluit. — Nec Panem in quo ipsum Corpus suum representat.* That is to say, neither has he [viz. Christ] to this time rejected or disdained Water, wherewith he washeth his own, (speaking of Baptism) nor Bread whereby he representeth his own Body, (speaking of the Sacrament).

2. Century
Tertullian flourished An. 210.

In his First Book against *Marcion*, a little before the middle of the Book.

His ancient Father, could not explain our Doctrine in more plain terms; for he doth not say, the Bread which is his true and real Body, but the Bread whereby he representeth his Body, which is our Doctrine, and what I had to prove in the Second Part of my Proposition.

And in his Third Book against the same Heretick.

In his Third Book against *Marcion*.

Hoc lignum & Jeremias tibi insinuat victuris prædicans Judæis venite mittamus lignum in panem ejus, utique in corpus sic enim Deus in Evangelio quoque vestro revelavit, panem corpus suum appellans, ut & hinc jam cum intelligas corporis sui figuram dedisse, cujus retro corpus in panem Prophetes figuravit. That is to say

“ The Prophet *Jeremiah* has plainly described this Wood, for telling the Jews, what their Posterity should say, Come let us thrust Wood into his Bread, even into his Body; for so has GOD

“ Revealed

“ Revealed (*i.e.* Interpreted) it in your Gospel, calling Bread his
 “ Body, that you might hence understand that he gave the figure of
 “ his Body, whose Body the Prophet figuratively exprest by Bread.
 Observe the last words of this Doctrine, and how this antient Father
 explains his Faith and Belief, concerning the blessed Sacrament ; he
 doth not say that Christ gave his own true and real Body, and Bo-
 dily Flesh, (as our Adversaries do confidently say) but on the con-
 trary he says, that Christ calls the Bread his Body ; and immediate-
 ly he expounds the mind of Christ thus, that we might understand
 it, not to be his Body, but the figure or representation of his Body,
 which is plainly our Doctrine.

*In his Fourth
 Book against
 Marcion.*

And yet again in his Fourth Book, written against the
 same Heretick, he proves our Doctrine to clear by his ex-
 position of the words of the Institution of the blessed Sa-
 crament, *this is my Body*, that the meer reading his words may suffice
 fully to convince and persuade any Man not prepossessed that our
 Doctrine is the Doctrine of the Primitive Church ; these are his Words
 and Doctrine, and what was then believed in the Church of GOD.
*Acceptum Panem & distributum Discipulis Corpus suum illum effecit, hoc
 est Corpus meum, dicendo, id est Figura Corporis mei, Figura autem non
 fuisset, nisi veritatis esset Corpus.* That is to say.

“ The Bread that he had taken, (speaking of our Saviour,) and
 “ divided among his Disciples he made his own Body, by saying,
 “ this is my Body, that is to say, the Figure of my Bo-
 “ dy, for it had not been a true Figure, unless there were a true
 “ Body.

Observe that this Heretick *Marcion*, denied the veritie of Christs
 humane Nature, and the veritie of his sufferings ; whereupon of ne-
 cessity followeth this conclusion, that we are not saved indeed, but
 only (to use *Marcions* own words) *Purative*, that is, in Fancy
 or Supposition, &c.

*Tertulian proves against
 Marcion, that Christ had a
 true and real Body, because
 the Sacrament is a true Figure
 of that Body.*

Tertulian to confute this Heresie, and to
 prove that Christ had a true Body, and that
 he truly suffered Death for our Redemption,
 assumes the Sacrament as a sure ground and
 reason, saying, that *Christ made the Bread a true Figure of his Body ;*
 but

but the Sacrament could not be a true Figure, unless Christ had a true Body, and therefore he concludes against this Heretick, that Christ had a true Body, for that the Sacrament is a true Figure of that Body. Observe that this was a prevailing and convincing Argument against *Marcion*, because he received the Gospel.

This doubtless was a favourable, nay, and necessary occasion for this antient Father, and the rest who after him writ against this Heresie, to prove the Sacrament to be the real and carnal Body of Christ, if they had thought or believed it to be so; but far from any such Doctrine, *Tertulian* expounds these words, *this is my Body*, in a figurative sense, giving the sense thus, *that is to say, the Figure of my Body*, and concluding therefore against *Marcion*, that Christ had a true Body, because the Sacrament is a true Figure of his Body.

This is more than sufficient for any man, who without partiality or prevention, shall weigh and esteem the Doctrine of this antient Father, to discern and understand what was the Faith and Belief of the Primitive Christians concerning the blessed Sacrament.

If time did permit me, I could bring down many more proofs of this Doctrine, out of the Writings of other Fathers of the Second Century of the Church, but that I might not be tedious, I shall prove now, that our Doctrine is conform to what was Taught and Believed by the Fathers of the Third Century of the *Third Century* Church.

Though I have already, in the First Part of this Discourse, quoted the Doctrine of *Origenes*, yet I thought fit to repeat it here in its due place; for that the Answer of our Adversaries to this Doctrine, will furnish us with a convincing Argument against their Doctrine of Transubstantiation.

Origenes in his 7th Homily or Exposition of *Leviticus*, after he had affirmed that the Flesh of Christ, is the Word of GOD, adds this exposition of the 6th Chap. of *S. John*. *Origenes in his Seventh Hom.*

Si enim secundum literam sequaris hoc, quod dictum est, nisi manducaveritis Carnem Filij Hominis, & biberitis ejus Sanguinem, occidit hac litera. That is to say,

For if you believe in a literal sense what is said, *Except you eat the Flesh of the Son of Man, and drink his Blood, that literal sense kills or destroys.* The Consequence therefore is clear, that we must understand,

derstand these verses of the Sixth Chapter of *St. John*, in a Figurative and Spiritual Sense, if we are willing to have Life in us. But this is plainly our Doctrine and Belief, and therefore the Doctrine of our Adversaries, is contrary to the Doctrine of this antient Father, and to the Primitive Church.

Our Adversaries (though to no purpose) do devise and invent many Answers to this Doctrine of *Origenes*, and because they dare not openly deny the Doctrine of this great Doctor, they answer, that this passage proves indeed, that the Sixth Chap. of *St. John*, is not to be understood of the blessed Sacrament.

Our Adversaries are forced to abandon the Sixth Chap. of St. John, and therefore have no proof in Scripture for Transubstantiation.

But by this Answer, they unawares give the Sword out of their own hands, for since they own, as they are forced to do by this Doctrine of *Origenes*, that this Chapter is to be understood in a spiritual sense, as we understand it, and that it is not to be understood of the blessed Sacrament, they have no Proof in Scripture for the Doctrine of Transubstantiation: and as it now appeareth, it was never known to the Fathers of the primitive Church, and therefore is to be rejected as false.

Sanctus Cyprianus, Bishop of Carthage, suffered Martyrdom under Valerianus Anno 261.

We find among the Works of *Sanctus Cyprianus* a Sermon of the Supper of the Lord, preached by another Author, but recorded and kept in the Books of this antient Father, wherein we read these Words: *Hæc quoties agimus, non dentes ad mordendum acimus, sed fide sincerâ panem sanctum frangimus.* That is to say: "As often as we do these things, (that is, receive the Body and Blood of Christ,) we prepare not our Teeth to bite or chew, but we break this holy Bread by the sincerity of Faith.

Consider that this Doctrine contradicts and destroys the carnal eating of the Sacrament, by these Words; As often as we do these things, we must not prepare or whet our Teeth for chawing; And proves plainly, that we are partakers of this holy Bread, only by Faith, by these last Words: *But we break this holy Bread by sincerity of Faith, which is plainly our Doctrine.* Now let us come to the fourth Century of the Church.

The 4th Century.

Saint

Saint *Ambrose* that great Doctor who Converted St. *Austin* in his Book of disposing Catechumens or Profelites to the Mysteries of our Faith, the Ninth Chapter sets down his mind concerning the blessed Sacrament, in these words.

Ambrosius Bishop of Milan after many troubles suffered for 22 Years, that he Governed the Church of Milan, and many good Books Written against the Heretick of his time. Dyed Anno 397

Ante benedictionem Verborum Cælestium una species nominatur, post Consecrationem Corpus Christi significatur. That is to say,

“Before the Benediction by the Heavenly Words, we call it another Species or Thing (speaking of the Bread) after the Consecration, the Body of Christ is thereby signified. By these words he proves plainly our Doctrine; for he do's not say that the Sacrament is the real Body of Christ after the Consecration; but he says plainly that it signifies or represents the Body of Christ.

And in his Fourth Book upon the Sacraments and Fourth Chapter he says, *Nos bibere similitudinem pretiosi Sanguinis.* That is to say, That we drink the similitude or representation of the precious Blood.

And in the same Book he calls the Oblation of the Altar, or of the LORD's Table, the Figure of the Body of Christ. It would be too tedious to quote here all passages of his to this purpose, for this he proves in the most part of this Book.

And in his Book of Christian Duties, the Fourty Eighth Chapter, speaking of the Blessed Sacrament, he proves that the true Body of Christ is in Heaven, and that we have upon Earth but its Image or Representation, He affirms, *umbram fuisse in lege, Imaginem in Evangelio, veritatem in Cælestibus.* That is to say, “That in the Law was the Shadow of the Body of Christ, in the Gospel the Image or Representation, and the truth in Heaven. By this Doctrine he proves plainly that the true Body of Christ is in Heaven, and that we have upon Earth but its Image or Figure in the Sacrament, which is our Doctrine. And therefore you plainly now understand by the Writings of this great Doctor, and by what he taught, that our Doctrine is the Doctrine of the Primitive Church in his time.

I could quote here more proofs out of his Fourth Book upon the Sacraments, but that I may not be tedious, I shall come to the Fifth

derstand these verses of the Sixth Chapter of *St. John*, in a Figurative and Spiritual Sense, if we are willing to have Life in us. But this is plainly our Doctrine and Belief, and therefore the Doctrine of our Adversaries, is contrary to the Doctrine of this antient Father, and to the Primitive Church.

Our Adversaries (though to no purpose) do devise and invent many Answers to this Doctrine of *Origenes*, and because they dare not openly deny the Doctrine of this great Doctor, they answer, that this passage proves indeed, that the Sixth Chap. of *St. John*, is not to be understood of the blessed Sacrament.

Our Adversaries are forced to abandon the Sixth Chap. of St. John, and therefore have no proof in Scripture for Transubstantiation.

But by this Answer, they unawares give the Sword out of their own hands, for since they own, as they are forced to do by this Doctrine of *Origenes*, that this Chapter is to be understood in a spiritual sense, as we understand it, and that it is not to be understood of the blessed Sacrament, they have no Proof in Scripture for the Doctrine of Transubstantiation: and as it now appeareth, it was never known to the Fathers of the primitive Church, and therefore is to be rejected as false.

Sanctus Cyprianus, Bishop of Carthage, suffered Martyrdom under Valerianus Anno 261.

We find among the Works of *Sanctus Cyprianus* a Sermon of the Supper of the Lord, preached by another Author, but recorded and kept in the Books of this antient Father, wherein we read these Words: *Hæc quoties agimus, non dentes ad mordendum acuimus, sed fide sincerâ panem sanctum frangimus.* That is to say: "As often as we do these things, (that is, receive the Body and Blood of Christ,) we prepare not our Teeth to bite or chew, but we break this holy Bread by the sincerity of Faith.

Consider that this Doctrine contradicts and destroys the carnal eating of the Sacrament, by these Words; As often as we do these things, we must not prepare or whet our Teeth for chewing; And proves plainly, that we are partakers of this holy Bread, only by Faith, by these last Words: *But we break this holy Bread by sincerity of Faith, which is plainly our Doctrine.* Now let us come to the fourth Century of the Church.

Th. 4th Century.

Saint

Saint *Ambrose* that great Doctor who Converted St. *Austin* in his Book of disposing Catechumens or Profelites to the Mysteries of our Faith, the Ninth Chapter sets down his mind concerning the blessed Sacrament, in these words.

Ambrosius Bishop of Mil-lane after many troubles suffered for 22 Years, that he Governed the Church of Mil-lane, and many good Books Written against the Heretick of his time. Dyed Anno 397

Ante benedictionem Verborum Cælestium una species nominatur, post Consecrationem Corpus Christi significatur. That is to say,

“Before the Benediction by the Heavenly Words, we call it another “Species or Thing (speaking of the Bread) after the Consecration, “the Body of Christ is thereby signified. By these words he proves plainly our Doctrine; for he do’s not say that the Sacrament is the real Body of Christ after the Consecration; but he says plainly that it signifies or represents the Body of Christ.

And in his Fourth Book upon the Sacraments and Fourth Chapter he says, *Nos bibere similitudinem pretiosi Sanguinis.* That is to say, That we drink the similitude or representation of the precious Blood.

And in the same Book he calls the Oblation of the Altar, or of the LORD’s Table, the Figure of the Body of Christ. It would be too tedious to quote here all passages of his to this purpose, for this he proves in the most part of this Book.

And in his Book of Christian Duties, the Fourty Eighth Chapter, speaking of the Blessed Sacrament, he proves that the true Body of Christ is in Heaven, and that we have upon Earth but its Image or Representation, He affirms, *umbram fuisse in lege, Imaginem in Evangelio, veritatem in Cælestibus.* That is to say, “That in the “Law was the Shadow of the Body of Christ, in the Gospel the “Image or Representation, and the truth in Heaven. By this Doctrine he proves plainly that the true Body of Christ is in Heaven, and that we have upon Earth but its Image or Figure in the Sacrament, which is our Doctrine. And therefore you plainly now understand by the Writings of this great Doctor, and by what he taught, that our Doctrine is the Doctrine of the Primitive Church in his time.

I could quote here more proofs out of his Fourth Book upon the Sacraments, but that I may not be tedious, I shall come to the Fifth

Century of the Church, and prove that St. *Chrysoftom*, *Theodoretus*, and St. *Austin*, never knew or Preached any Doctrine concerning the Blessed Sacrament but our Doctrine.

Saint Chry-
softom Bishop
and Doctor.
Died Anno.
407.

Saint *Chrysoftom* in his Exposition of the Twenty Second Psalm, *ut quotidie in similitudinem Corporis & Sanguinis Panem & Vinum secundum ordinem Melchisedech nobis ostenderet in Sacramento.* That is to say, That he might daily shew us Bread and Wine, after the manner of *Melchisedech* in representation of his own Body and Blood: this is our Doctrine plainly, for St. *Chrysoftom* does not say, that he might shew us Bread and Wine, which are his own real Body and Blood, but the Representation or Likeness of his own Body and Blood.

To this Doctrine our Adversaries do Answer, that these Commentaries, and the Epistle of St. *Chrysoftom* to *Cesarius*, and his Commentaries upon the Gospel of St. *Matthew*, are not the Works of St. *Chrysoftom*: And this they say, because our Doctrine is plain in these Works. But whosoever is the Author of these Works, our Adversaries cannot deny, but that they are antient Works, and the Doctrine of that Age; and therefore may furnish a strong Proof, of the truth of our Doctrine. But however, since they will not allow, that these Works are the Works of St. *Chrysoftom*, let us come to the Works of *Theodoretus* and St. *Austin*, which they cannot deny to be theirs.

Theodoretus Bishop of Cy-
rus a Town in Syria, continued
at least Thirty Years in his
Ministry, and ended his Life,
as is supposed, under the
Reign of Leo the First. Anno.
450 In the First of his learn-
ed Dialogues, and Eighth
Chap.

Theodoretus Bishop of *Cyrus*, who was nothing inferiour to the most Wise, Accurate and Learned Writers of the antient time, in the First of his learned Dialogues proves that the Word became Flesh, (these are his words) without changing of the Divine Nature, into the Humane Nature, or the Humane Nature into the Divine. “ Even as in the Sacrament of the Supper of the LORD, the Bread becomes the Body of the LORD, not by changing the substance of it; but by assuming, by grace, another use than it had, the very Symbol obtaineth the name of the thing, represented by the Symbol. When our Adversaries do read these Dialogues of *Theodoretus*, I do not know how they can, with as great confidence as they do, brag or boast of the Antiquity, of the Doctrine of Transubstantiation. St.

St. *Austin* in his Second Volum and Thirteenth Epistle, says, *Si Sacramenta quandam similitudinem earum rerum, quarum Sacramenta sunt non haberent, omnino Sacramenta non essent ex hac autem similitudine plerumque etiam ipsarum rerum nomina accipiunt: sicut ergo secundum quendam modum Sacramentum Corporis Christi, Corpus Christi est, Sacramentum Sanguinis Christi Sanguis Christi est, ita Sacramentum Fidei, Fides est.* That is to say,

“ If the Sacraments had not some similitude or representation of the things, where-
 “ of they are Sacraments, they should in no
 “ manner be Sacraments, and by this similitude or representation they receive commonly the very name of
 “ the thing, that they represent. Therefore as the Sacrament of
 “ the Body of Christ in some manner, is the Body of Christ, and
 “ the Sacrament of the Blood of Christ, in some manner is the Blood
 “ of Christ, so the Sacrament of Faith, is Faith.

Observe First, that St. *Austin* by this Doctrine proves, that a Sacrament should not be a Sacrament, unless it representeth the thing, whereof it is a Sacrament. But his Doctrine is far from saying, that the Sacrament ought to be the thing it self, that it represents, as our Adversaries with confidence do say; so we say with St. *Austin* that the Bread is a Sacrament, because it represents the Body of Christ.

Observe Secondly that the reason why (according to St. *Austins* Doctrine) we commonly call the Sacrament the Body of Christ, is not that it is the real Body of Christ, but (as St. *Austin* says) because it represents the Body of Christ, and observe that this same reason *Theodoretus* giveth, as I have already mentioned.

Observe in the Third place what St. *Austin* says, that even as the Sacrament in some manner, is the Body and Blood of Christ, so the Sacrament of Faith (which is Baptism) is Faith. But Baptism, as every man of Sense knows, and as our Adversaries do allow, in a proper sense is not Faith, but the seal of Faith; in like manner, (according to St. *Austin*) the Sacrament in a proper sense, is not

St. *Austin* after his return to Africk was Coadjutor to Valerius Bishop of Hippo, as Chrysostom was to Flavianus in Antiochia; he succeeded Valerius in the Bishoprick of Hippo. His great Travels in Preaching the Word of GOD, and stopping the Mouths of Hereticks, and Gain-sayers of the truth of GOD, especially Donatists, Pelagians and Manichean Hereticks, his learned Writings do testifie. He lived Seventy Six Years. The Vandals took the Town of Hippo, which in the time of Austins Sickness they had Besieged. Anno. 436.

the real Body of Christ, but the remembrance or representation of the Body of Christ.

And in his Book against *Adimantus*, the Twelfth Chapter, he opens his mind plainly concerning the Sacrament, in these words.

Non dubitavit Dominus dicere, hoc est Corpus meum, cum Figuram daret Corporis sui. That is to say,

“ Our Saviour did not scruple to say, this is my Body, (note the exposition of these words according to St. *Austin*) “ When he “ gave the Figure of his Body. By this Exposition and Doctrine it is plain to any man of Understanding, First that St. *Austin* understood these words, This is my Body, in a Figurative and Spiritual Sense, Secondly, that St. *Austin* believed and professed that our Saviour gave his Disciples only the Figure of his Body, and this Doctrine he confirms.

In his Exposition of the Third Psalm, by these words. *Christus adhibuit Judam ad Convivium, in quo Corporis sui Figuram Discipulis commendavit.* That is to say,

“ Christ admitted *Judas* to the Banquet wherein he delivered to “ his Disciples the Figure of his Body. By this Doctrine St. *Austin* proves plainly, that our Saviour did not give his own real Body, but the only Figure or Representation of his Body.

And in his Exposition of the Ninety Eighth Psalm, where he proves plainly, that the Apostles did not Eat the Flesh of Christ, or drank his Blood, but Spiritually or by Faith, which is the proof of the last Part of my Proposition. In this place St. *Austin*

The Proof of the last Part of my Proposition. speaks in the person of Christ. *Non hoc Corpus quod videtis manducaturi estis, & bibituri illum Sanguinem, quem fusuri sunt, qui me Crucifigent. Sacramentum aliquod vobis commendo: Spiritualiter intellectum vivificabit vos.* That is to say,

“ You are not to eat this Body which you see, neither “ drink the Blood, which they that shall Crucifie me shall spill; “ but I commend unto you a Sacrament, which Spiritually believed, “ shall give you life.

I say again that it is an extream surprize and wonder to me, how our Adversaries can be so confident, as to brag of Antiquity, for their Doctrine of Transubstantiation, when they read these Works of

of St. *Austin*. For if he had lived to this day, he could never speak in more plain and convincing Terms against Transubstantiation, than to say, that the Apostles did not eat the Body of Christ which they had seen, nor drank his Blood which was spilt, but in a Spiritual manner or by Faith : and that this Spiritual manner of eating, is the means to give them life; which Doctrine he confirms.

In his Twenty Fifth Tract, where he Expounds the Holy Gospel according to St. *John*, in these words. *Ut quid paras Dentes & Ventrem ? crede & manducasti.* That is to say,

“ Why do you prepare your Teeth and Belly ? believe and you have eaten. It is plain, that the means whereby we receive the Body and Blood of Christ, according to this Doctrine of St. *Austin*, is Faith, as it appeareth by these words, *Believe and you have eaten.*

And yet in his Twenty Sixth Tract or Treatise, he again confirms the same Doctrine, saying, *Credere in eum hoc est manducare Panem Vivum.* That is to say,

To believe in him, this is to eat the Living Bread. That is to say, we eat it only by Faith.

For the Application of all this Doctrine, observe First, that St. *Austin* as all the rest of the soundest part of the Fathers of the Primitive Church, do call the Sacrament (as I proved) Bread only, sometimes a Figure or Representation of the Body of Christ.

Secondly, that they deny, and in particular St. *Austin*, that the Apostles did eat the Body of Christ, or drank his Blood but Spiritually, and that by this they overthrow and gainsay, the Carnal eating of the Body of Christ, in the Sacrament.

Thirdly, they call the Sacrament Bread, and the Bread of Life.

Fourthly, that they say, that we eat it only by Faith, *Crede & manducasti.* Believe and you have eaten.

But this is our Doctrine in every Part and Particle *Conclusion.* of it ; and therefore our Doctrine is the only Doctrine, that in this case is conform and consonant to the soundest part of all the Fathers of the Primitive Church. And consequently the Doctrine of Christ, which is the Second Part of my Proposition, and what I had to prove.

Before I come to the Third and last Part of my Discourse, dear Brethren

Brethren let us seriously consider, that it is not sufficient for us, to know and to prove, that our Doctrine is the Doctrine of the Primitive Church, and consequently the Doctrine of Christ, (for the more we know, the more we have to answer for,) unless we pass from the Speculation to the practice of our Doctrine, and follow the examples of those good Christians of the Primitive Church in our Lives, as well as in our Doctrine; and dispose our selves often by Fasting and Praying, and especially by being in Charity with all the World, to receive this blessed Sacrament with Reverence, Acknowledging and Confessing our manifold Sins, and begging with an humble and contrite heart Pardon and Forgiveness of our Sins and Iniquities through the Merits of our Saviour and Redeemer Jesus Christ. These are the dispositions that St. *Ambrose* and St. *Austin* had, and preached to the Christians of the primitive Church, and these are the Dispositions that we ought to have when we come with a sincere and upright Faith to receive this heavenly and spiritual nourishment of our Souls. Consider Dear Brethren, that when we come to the Lords Table, and eat of this heavenly Bread, without these Dispositions, and without Examining our selves, as St. *Paul* requireth in his first Epistle to the Corinth. II. Chap. vers. 28. we are no less *guilty of the Body and Blood of Christ*, then the Jews who crucified Christ were, S. *Paul* proves this in the same Chapter, vers. 29. *For he that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh his own damnation, because he discerneth not the Lords Body.*

To eat and drink unworthily the blessed Sacrament, is to eat it and drink it without the Reverence, that is due to it; But he that eateth and drinketh without the dispositions, that I now laid down before you, eateth and drinketh without the Reverence that is due to the blessed Sacrament. And therefore such an unhappy Christian, eateth and drinketh his own damnation. The Example of those good Christians of the primitive Church is sufficient to encourage us, to dispose our selves often, to receive the blessed Sacrament with Reverence and true Faith, and the Doctrine of St. *Paul* is sufficient to terrifie and frighten us from coming to the blessed Sacrament, unless we be well disposed.

Now that I have proved that the Protestant Doctrine is the only
Doctrine

Doctrine that is conform to the Word of God, and to the foundest Part of all the Fathers of the primitive Church, I come to the third and last part of my Proposition; wherein I am to prove, that the Protestant Doctrine is the only Doctrine, that is conform to Sense and Reason.

The Third Part.

TO prove the Truth of this Part of my Proposition, it is sufficient,

First, to prove that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is against Sense, and therefore that by this Doctrine the greatest evidence of Christian Religion is lost. *First Proposition.*

Secondly, to prove that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is against Reason, in as much as it doth force Christians to believe as Articles of Faith, what Christ never revealed, things absolutely impossible, and gross Contradictions. Which two Propositions being proved, it will evidently appear, that our Doctrine is the only Doctrine, that is conform to Sense and Reason; In the first place, I prove that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is against Sense; And hereby that the greatest evidence of Christian Religion is lost. *Second Proposition.*

If I am as sure, that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is false, as they are sure, that Christian Religion is true, our Doctrine is the only Doctrine that is conform to Sense and Reason. But I am as sure that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is false, as they are sure, that Christian Religion is true. Therefore our Doctrine is the only Doctrine that is conform to Sense and Reason. *Prove of the first Proposition.*

The first Proposition of this Argument is undeniable to any Man of Sense.

As for the second, that I am as sure that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is false, as they are sure that Christian Religion is true. I prove

The greatest assurance they have of Christian Religion, and the greatest evidence that was in the days of Christ, is, what sense doth

doth afford ; But this assurance of sense that they have of Christian Religion, is an evidence to me that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is false. Therefore I am as sure that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is false, as they are sure that Christian Religion is true.

The first Proposition, that the greatest assurance they have, and the greatest evidence that was in the days of Christ, of Christian Religion, was, what Sense did afford, I prove.

The greatest Argument of Christianity that was in the days of Christ, was the Words that Christ spake, and the Works that Christ did. — But no Man could be sure, that Christ did so speak, or so work, if he may not credit the reports of his Eys and Ears. And therefore the greatest evidence they have, and that was in the days of Christ, of Christian Religion, was, what Sense did afford.

This Argument is evident, and there is not one Proposition that can be denied. — For this was St. *Luke's* great evidence of what he writes, that it was *delivered to him by Eye-witnesses*, Chap. 1. and 2. vers. And St. *John's*, *What we have seen with our own Eyes, and our Hands have handled of the Word of life*. And St. *Paul's* for Christs Resurrection, *That he was seen of Cephas, then of the twelve, then of the 500.* 1 Cor. 15 Chap. 5. and 6 ver. Even *Thomas* his infidelity yielded to this Argument, that if he *thrust his Hand into Christs side, he would believe*, John Chap. 20. vers. 25. Christ himself judged this a convincing Argument, when the Apostles thought he had been a Spirit, *handle me and see, for a Spirit hath not flesh and bones, as you see me have*, Luke 24. vers. 29. Since now I have proved that the greatest evidence of Christian Religion is, what Senses doth afford, I shall now resume my Argument, and Prove that the assurance they have of Christian Religion, is an evidence to me, that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is false.

For as all their Senses do tell them, as a convincing Argument, that Christian Religion is true, so all my Senses do tell me as a convincing Argument, that the blessed Sacrament is only Bread and Wine: or if we may not credit our Senses as they say, we must not, concerning the Sacrament, then by the Doctrine of Transubstantiation the greatest evidence of Christianity is lost, which I had to prove. And by this it doth clearly appear, that our Doctrine is the only Doctrine that is conform to Sense. My

My second Argument is, that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is against Reason.

That Doctrine is against Reason, that makes People believe as Articles of Faith, what Christ never revealed, things absolutely impossible and gross Contradictions. *Proof of the second Proposition*
But the Doctrine of Transubstantiation makes People believe as Articles of Faith, what Christ never revealed, things absolutely impossible, and gross Contradictions. Therefore the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is against Reason.

As for the first Proposition, that Doctrine is against Reason, that makes People believe as Articles of Faith, what Christ never revealed, things absolutely impossible, and gross Contradictions, it cannot be denied.

As for the second Proposition, that the Doctrine of Transubstantiation makes People believe as Articles of Faith, what Christ never revealed, things absolutely impossible, and gross Contradictions, it will evidently appear, when I have laid down here before you, some part of their Doctrine, concerning the Sacrament, which is imposed upon Christians by the Pope and the Council of *Trent*, with no less Obligation to believe, as Articles of Faith, then what is contained in the Profession of our Christian Faith, I mean in the Creed, and revealed by God himself.

First they say that by these Words, *This is my Body*, &c. the substance of the Bread and Wine is changed into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ. [First Part of their Doctrine and Belief concerning the blessed Sacrament,] and this they call *Transubstantiation*, a Word invented in the Council of *Lateran*, in the Year 1215, for *Scotus* one of the chiefest of their own Schoolmen subscribes, that before this Council the Doctrine of Transubstantiation was not believed as an Article of Faith; and to this Testimony of *Scotus*, *Bellarmino* cannot otherwise answer, then by *a minime probandum*, (*that it is not to be allowed;*) but he cannot deny, but the Word Transubstantiation was invented in this Council, and that the Doctrine and Belief of Transubstantiation until the Year 1060, was a matter of indifference, and not an Article of Faith, as *Tonstall* another of their own best Schoolmen professeth in his first Book upon the Sacrament 48. pag. *Demode*

quo id fieret, fortasse satius erat curiosum quemque relinquere conjecturæ, sicut liberum fuit ante Concilium Lateranense ; That is to say, "Of the manner and means (of the Real presence,) how it might be, either by Transubstantiation, or otherwise, perhaps it had been better to leave every Man that would be curious, to his own Conjecture, as before the Council of Lateran, it was left. I could bring down many more Writers and Schoolmen in their own Church, who are so far from granting Antiquity and Universality to this Doctrine, that they profess, the Doctrine of Transubstantiation was lately received into the Church for a Point of Faith, but it is a matter of fact, that it was never believed as a point of Faith until 1060, (if then) when in the Council of Rome under Nicolaus the II. this Question was debated, but not decided, (as Bellarmine says,) for it was never openly decreed as an Article of Faith, before the Council of Lateran, in the Year 1215, and made use of in the Council of Trent, so that by succession of time corrupt and false Doctrine settled and rooted it self, and became a Law.

But observe that Christ never revealed this Part of their Doctrine: nor intended by these Words *This is my Body*, to change the substance of the Bread into his own real Body, as it appeareth first, because these Words taken in their proper Sense cannot be true, as I shall with the help of God, hereafter prove, when time and leisure shall permit me to speak in a particular Discourse of the Sense of these Words. Secondly, because Transubstantiation was never known in the primitive Church, as I already proved, which certainly had been known, if Christ intended by these Words, *This is my Body*, &c. to change the substance of the Bread into the substance of his own Body.

2. They say that the Body of Christ is within the Circumference of the Bread, and not this only, but the whole Body of Christ, is in the least crumb of the Bread, [second part of their Faith and Belief concerning the Sacrament.] To confute this second part of their Doctrine, observe first, that we are not bound to believe any thing as an Article of Faith, but what God has declared unto us, by constant Revelation in the holy Scripture.

Secondly that all their Divines, as well as ours, agree, that no Article of Christian Religion is contrary to reason.

But

But as to this second Part of their Doctrine and Faith concerning the blessed Sacrament, they must own and confess that Christ never revealed in any place of the whole Scripture, that his real Body is within the Circumference of the Bread, and not this only, but that his whole Body is in the least crumb of the Bread; and therefore it is an unexcusable mistake, and damnable Errour in learned Men to advance and impose wilfully upon Christians such Doctrine, as a matter of Faith, which as they themselves well know, if they would, but speak sincerely, Christ never revealed or taught in any place of the whole Scripture.

To come therefore more closely to the second Particular, that I proposed. Their Doctrine as to this Part is absolutely against Reason.

For it is impossible and absolutely against Reason, that the same Body at the same time, could be bigger than it self, longer than it self, broader than it self. But if the whole Body of Christ, be in the least crumb of the Bread, as they say, & will have it a matter of Faith in their Church, The Body of Christ is bigger than it self, longer than it self, & broader than it self, at the same time: for it is evident that the Body of Christ in Heaven is bigger, longer and broader than it self in a Wafer or a small crumb of Bread. And therefore the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is absolutely against Reason.

Thirdly, they say that the Body of Christ is in the Sacrament without its dimensions, that is to say, that it is neither long, large, or profound, and yet that it remaineth still a natural and true Body, [third part of their Faith concerning the Sacrament.]

First this is absolutely against Reason, for it is impossible for any Man to understand, how a Body can remain a natural and true Body without being long, large, and profound, as I shall prove.

Secondly this is a new invented Doctrine, for such Doctrine was never taught in the Primitive Church, nay St. *Austin* taught and professed the contrary, and as if he had foreseen the inventions of our Adversaries, he prevented them, and confuted this Part of their Doctrine in his first Book and 57th Epistle, saying that Bodies cannot exist without their dimensions, these are his Words.

Tolle corporibus spatia, & nusquam erunt, & quia nusquam erunt, nec erunt, tolle corpora qualitatibus corporum, nec erit ubi sunt, & ideo necesse est ut non sint. That is to say in a Word. "Take away their
D 2 "dimen-

“ dimensions from Bodies, and they shall be no where, and because “ they shall be no where, neither can they exist. And therefore according to the Doctrine of St. *Austin* it is absolutely impossible, that a Body could remain, and be in being without its dimensions. This is what St. *Austin* taught, and this is what is conform to reason and experience, and Christ never revealed in any place of the whole Scripture the contrary to be possible. But the Doctrine of Transubstantiation doth force Christians to believe the contrary as a professed point of their Faith, and therefore the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is a new invented Doctrine absolutely against reason.

Thirdly the only essential difference we find between a Body and a Spirit, is, that a Spirit has no dimensions, that it is indivisible, or cannot be divided, and that it takes up no room or place. All this we understand and conceive plainly to be true and possible, because a Spirit has no parts ; so that it is impossible and a manifest Contradiction, that any thing could have or enjoy all these essential properties of a Spirit, that is to say, first to be without dimensions, or as Divines speak, to be in a place in a definitive manner ; secondly, to be indivisible ; thirdly to be in a place and take up no room, without being a Spirit. But the Doctrine of Transubstantiation doth force Christians to believe, that the Body of Christ is in the Sacrament, first without its dimensions, 2. that it is indivisible, 3. that it takes up no room, and yet that it remaineth still a true Body, and has its divisible Parts, which is a horrid Contradiction, for it is to say, that it is, and that it is not a Body at the same time ; and therefore the Doctrine of Transubstantiation is absolutely against reason. He that can believe all these inventions of Men, I am sure, will stick at nothing.

4. They say, that as the Body of Christ by Divine power is at the same time in several places in an invisible manner, so might any other Body by Divine power, be at the same time in several places in a visible manner. Observe what Extremities the Doctrine of Transubstantiation has lead them to ; for they must either maintain by right or wrong, that it is not against the Nature, or Essence of a Body, and that it is possible by Divine power, that *John*, (for Example) can be at the same time in several places, as in *Dublin*, in *London*,

London, in *Rome*, nay at the same time in all places of the whole World, or the Doctrine of Transubstantiation falls of it self. For they say that wherever a Popish Mass is said, there the real Body of Christ is, so that if a Mass was said upon every Foot of the whole Earth, the Body of Christ should likewise be upon every Foot of the whole Earth. And so might any other Body be (as they say,) by Divine power.

And so let us suppose, as they do, that *John* by Divine power, (which as you understand is impossible,) is at the same time in *London*, in *Paris*, and in *Dublin*. They say, that *John* in all these places at the same time, wherever he is, is Master of his own actions, and can do what he please.

Grounded upon this false Principle they say, that it is possible, that *John* could be here at Divine service, and at the same time be in *London* fast asleep, and in *Paris* waking.

2. That *John* in *London* may walk towards *Dublin*, and *John* in *Dublin* may walk towards *London*, and so they may meet, (shall I say the one the other,) but you may be sure, it will be a merry meeting.

3. *John* may be feasting in *London*, and fasting in *Dublin* in the same moment, &c.

I am sure there is no Man that will credit reason, and speak sincerely without partiality or prevention, but will judge all this Doctrine impossible, and as so many horrid and monstrous Contradictions.

But they say more, that it is possible that *John* in *London* may lead a good righteous and a sober life, and at the same time be an ill and sinful liver in *Rome*, so that according to their Doctrine it is possible, that *John* in *Rome* should dye and be damned, and in the same instant dye in *London* and be saved, and so at the same time be an Angel in Heaven, and a Devil in Hell. This is, what is monstrous to maintain as possible; but it is, what the Doctrine of Transubstantiation doth force their Divines to maintain (by right or wrong) as possible; And therefore the Doctrine of Transubstantiation doth force Christians to believe, what is absolutely impossible, and gross Contradictions, and consequently is against Reason.

I might be infinite in reckoning many other impossibilities and horrid Contradictions of this Doctrine: I say again, that he that can believe them, I am sure shall stick at nothing.

*The Answer of
our Adversaries
to their Doctrine
above mention-
ed.*

Our Adversaries do answer to all these Arguments, that though all this Doctrine seems to us impossible, and against Reason, yet it is not impossible to God to do such things, and they say, that we measure GOD's power by our own Reason and Understanding; and because we find such things impossible to our own Reason, that we conclude, they are impossible to God.

*This Answer refuted
by 3. reasons.*

To confute clearly this Answer, observe three things.

1 Proposition.

First that they have no grounds to advance that what they teach in this Doctrine is possible to God.

2 Proposition.

2. That it is no dishonour to God, that he cannot (though infinite in power,) do what they teach in this

Doctrine.

3 Proposition.

3. That what they say of the infinite power of God, is a weak Argument, and proves nothing in this case.

*Proof of the
first Proposition.*

To prove my first Proposition, that they have no grounds to advance or prove what they teach in this Doctrine as possible to God, I say, first that they can never prove by reason, that the same Body may at the same time be in several places, and this part they allow; secondly God never revealed in any place of the whole Scripture such a thing to be possible; therefore they have no grounds to say that what they teach in this Doctrine is possible to God; for the only grounds they can have, is Reason or Revelation; But as I now did prove, they have neither the one or the other; and therefore they advance this Doctrine as possible to God without any grounds.

My second Proposition, that it is no dishonour to God, though infinite in power, that he cannot do what they teach in this Doctrine is clear.

For it is no dishonour to God, to say he cannot do things, when they are either sinful, (so God cannot lye,) or when they involve an absolute Contradiction; for God himself cannot make a Man the

the same time in the same manner to be dead and a live, that is, dead and not dead. God cannot make the whole less than a part of it ; he cannot make a Son to beget his Father ; he cannot make the same Man to be born at two several times, as their own Authors do confess : And therefore in like manner he cannot make the same Body to be in two several places at the same time, and without its dimensions ; for it is no less impossible than the other.

As for my third Proposition, that what they say of the infinite Power of God, is a weak Argument, and proves nothing in this matter, it is most certain :

For it is a weak Argument to say that God by his infinite power, can make the same Body at the same time to be in several places ; And then to conclude as an Article of Faith, that God hath so done. For though we may grant, as we do not, that God by his infinite power, can make the same Body to be at the same time in several places, yet because God never revealed in the whole Scripture, that he did any such thing ; our Adversaries do mistake and grossly err in concluding it as an Article of Faith.

*The Proof of the
third Proposition.*

This I shall make plain by a familiar Example : We know that God can create another World : we must not therefore conclude as an Article of Faith, that God has created another World, because God has never revealed it ; In like manner though we should know, as we do not, that God by his infinite power could make the same Body to be at the same time in several places, yet we must not conclude as an Article of Faith, that God has done so ; because he never revealed in any place of the whole Scripture, that he did any such thing. And therefore what our Adversaries say of the infinite power of God, is a weak Argument, and proves nothing in this case. And therefore what is to be concluded, is that their Doctrine is against reason, and consequently that our Doctrine is the only Doctrine that is conform to sense and reason.

Now dear Brethren, that I have shewed you plainly, that our Doctrine is the only Doctrine, that in this Controversie, is conform to the Word of God, to the Fathers of the Primitive Church, to sense and

I might be infinite in reckoning many other impossibilities and horrid Contradictions of this Doctrine: I say again, that he that can believe them, I am sure shall stick at nothing.

*The Answer of
our Adversaries
to their Doctrine
above mention-
ed.*

Our Adversaries do answer to all these Arguments, that though all this Doctrine seems to us impossible, and against Reason, yet it is not impossible to God to do such things, and they say, that we measure GOD's power by our own Reason and Understanding; and because we find such things impossible to our own Reason, that we conclude, they are impossible to God.

*This Answer refuted
by 3. reasons.*

To confute clearly this Answer, observe three things.

1 Proposition.

First that they have no grounds to advance that what they teach in this Doctrine is possible to God.

2 Proposition.

2. That it is no dishonour to God, that he cannot (though infinite in power,) do what they teach in this

Doctrine.

3 Proposition.

3. That what they say of the infinite power of God, is a weak Argument, and proves nothing in this case.

*Proof of the
first Proposition.*

To prove my first Proposition, that they have no grounds to advance or prove what they teach in this Doctrine as possible to God, I say, first that they can never prove by reason, that the same Body may at the same time be in several places, and this part they allow; secondly God never revealed in any place of the whole Scripture such a thing to be possible; therefore they have no grounds to say that what they teach in this Doctrine is possible to God; for the only grounds they can have, is Reason or Revelation; But as I now did prove, they have neither the one or the other; and therefore they advance this Doctrine as possible to God without any grounds.

My second Proposition, that it is no dishonour to God, though infinite in power, that he cannot do what they teach in this Doctrine is clear.

*The proof of the se-
cond Proposition.*

For it is no dishonour to God, to say he cannot do things, when they are either sinful, (so God cannot lye,) or when they involve an absolute Contradiction; for God himself cannot make a Man at the

the same time in the same manner to be dead and a live, that is, dead and not dead. God cannot make the whole less than a part of it ; he cannot make a Son to beget his Father ; he cannot make the same Man to be born at two several times, as their own Authors do confess : And therefore in like manner he cannot make the same Body to be in two several places at the same time, and without its dimensions ; for it is no less impossible than the other.

As for my third Proposition, that what they say of the infinite Power of God, is a weak Argument, and proves nothing in this matter, it is most certain :

For it is a weak Argument to say that God by his infinite power, can make the same Body at the same time to be in several places ; And then to conclude as *The Proof of the third Proposition.* an Article of Faith, that God hath so done. For though we may grant, as we do not, that God by his infinite power, can make the same Body to be at the same time in several places, yet because God never revealed in the whole Scripture, that he did any such thing ; our Adversaries do mistake and grossly err in concluding it as an Article of Faith.

This I shall make plain by a familiar Example : We know that God can create another World : we must not therefore conclude as an Article of Faith, that God has created another World, because God has never revealed it ; In like manner though we should know, as we do not, that God by his infinite power could make the same Body to be at the same time in several places, yet we must not conclude as an Article of Faith, that God has done so ; because he never revealed in any place of the whole Scripture, that he did any such thing. And therefore what our Adversaries say of the infinite power of God, is a weak Argument, and proves nothing in this case. And therefore what is to be concluded, is that their Doctrine is against reason, and consequently that our Doctrine is the only Doctrine that is conform to sense and reason.

Now dear Brethren, that I have shewed you plainly, that our Doctrine is the only Doctrine, that in this Controversie, is conform to the Word of God, to the Fathers of the Primitive Church, to sense and

and reason. I finish this Discourse, humbly begging our heavenly Father through the merits of our Saviour Jesus Christ, that it may please him to give us grace to walk truly and sincerely in our Doctrine, to fear and love him, and obey faithfully his Commandments, that after this transitory life, we may enjoy everlasting life and eternal happiness.

● I N I S

